

**MINUTES OF THE SCHOOLS FORUM MEETING  
THURSDAY 2 DECEMBER 2021 AT 4pm**

<b>School Members</b>		
<b>Headteachers</b>		
<b>Special (1)</b>	*Martin Doyle (Riverside)	
<b>Nursery Schools (1)</b>	(A) Sian McDermott	
<b>Primary (7)</b>	(A) Mary Gardiner (West Green)	(A) Michelle Randles - maternity leave Substitute member – Grant Bright (Rokesly Infants & Nursery)
	(A) Stephen McNicholas (St John Vianney)	(A) Paul Murphy (Lancasterian)
	Ian Scotchbrook (South Haringey)	Linda Sarr (Risley Avenue)
	Will Wawn (Bounds Green)	
<b>Secondary (2)</b>	(A) Andy Webster (Park View)	Tony Hartney (Gladesmore)
<b>Primary Academy (1)</b>	(A) Simon Knowles (LDBS Academies Trust)	
<b>Secondary Academies (3)</b>	Michael McKenzie (Alexandra Park)	Vacancy
	* Elen Roberts (Heartlands High)	
<b>Alternative Provision (1)</b>	Gerry Robinson	
<b>Governors</b>		
<b>Special (1)</b>	Jean Brown (The Vale)	
<b>Nursery School (1)</b>	Melian Mansfield (Pembury)	
<b>Primary Maintained (7)</b>	* Hannah D’Aguiar (Chestnuts Primary)	(A) John Keever (Seven Sisters)
	* Jenny Thomas (Lordship Lane)	Alex MacAskill (West Green Primary)
	(A) Dan Salem (Muswell Hill Primary)	Andrew Willett (Willow Primary)
<b>Secondary Maintained (3)</b>	Helen Froggatt (St Aidan’s Primary)	
	Laurence Penn (Highgate Wood)	
	Sylvia Dobie (Park View)	
<b>Primary Academy (1)</b>	Vacancy	
<b>Secondary Academies (3)</b>	* Noreen Graham (Woodside)	Vacancy
	Vacancy	
<b>Alternative Provision (1)</b>	Laura Butterfield	
<b>Non-School Members</b>		
<b>Non-Executive Councillor</b>	Cllr Sarah Williams	
<b>Trade Union Representative</b>	Paul Renny	
<b>Professional Association Representative</b>	Ed Harlow	
<b>Faith Schools</b>	(A) Geraldine Gallagher	
<b>14-19 Partnership</b>	(A) Kurt Hintz	
<b>Early Years Providers</b>	Susan Tudor-Hart	
<b>Observers</b>		
Riddhi Kachhela – Student from Goldsmiths College		
<b>Cabinet Member for CYPs</b>	Cllr Zena Brabazon	
<b>Also Attending</b>		
LBH Director of Children’s Services	(A) Ann Graham	
Chief Executive of Haringey Education Partnership (HEP)	James Page	
LBH Assistant Director, Schools & Learning	Eveleen Riordan	
LBH Assistant Director, Finance	(A) Thomas Skeen	
LBH Head of Finance	Josephine Lyseight	
LBH Head of Service, Integrated SEND	Mary Jarrett	
LBH Head of Strategic Commissioning, Early Help & Culture	(A) Ngozi Anuforo	
LBH Assistant Director Commissioning	* Charlotte Pomery	
LBH Interim Schools Finance Manager	Brian Smith	
LBH Finance Business Partner (Schools & Learning)	Muhammad Ali	
LBH Service Improvement & Children’s Services	* Karen Oellermann	

Lead for Governor Services (HEP)/Clerk (Minutes)	Neetha Atukorale
LBH Asst Director Early Help, Prevention and SEND Division	Jackie Difolco
LBH Head of Admissions and School Organisation	Carlo Kodosi
LBH Head of Audit and Risk Management	Minesh Jani
LBH HR Team	Antony Lewis

(A) = Apologies given

\* = Asterisk denotes absence

#### SUMMARY OF AGREED ACTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT FOR 13 JANUARY 2022 MEETING

ITEM	ACTION	FOLLOW UP
<b>10.12(21/10/21)</b> Previous meeting	Report outcome of the consultation and present recommendations at the Schools Forum meeting on 13 January 2022.	<b>BS/DSG Working group</b>
<b>1.7</b>	Promote the work of the Schools Forum to academy school governing boards to attract new members.	<b>Clerk - NA</b>
<b>3.2.4</b>	Invite HF to a SEND Panel meeting	<b>MJ</b>
<b>6.4</b>	Draft a response from Schools Forum to the DfE regarding the proposal to remove the School Improvement Grant	<b>JL,ER and WW</b>

#### MINUTES OF THE MEETING

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION ASSIGNED TO
<b>1.1</b>	<b>WELCOME</b>	
	The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all present to the meeting.	
<b>1.2</b>	<b>OBSERVERS AND REPRESENTATIVES</b>	
	There were no observers or representatives in attendance.	
<b>1.3</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
	<b>The Clerk confirmed that apologies had been received from:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Keever</li> <li>• Stephen McNicholas</li> <li>• Andy Webster</li> <li>• Paul Murphy</li> <li>• Sylvia Dobie</li> <li>• Sian McDermott</li> <li>• Ngozi Anuforo</li> </ul>	
<b>1.4</b>	<b>MEMBERSHIP UPDATE</b>	
	The Chair welcomed the following new primary maintained school governor representative to the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alex MacAskill – West Green Primary</li> <li>• Helen Froggatt – St Aidan’s Primary</li> <li>• Andrew Willett – Willow Primary</li> </ul>	
<b>1.5</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
	Alex MacAskill declared a professional interest as an employee of Hornsey School for Girls.	
<b>1.6</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 2 DECEMBER 2021</b>	
	Accuracies <b>Amendments to membership:</b> <b>To state:</b> Alex MacAskill (West Green Primary) Andrew Willett (Willow Primary)	

	<p><b>Addition</b> Laura Butterfield as Alternative Provision representative.</p> <p><b>Amendment</b> <b>Page 10 Item 13.4</b> <b>Amendment to state:</b> The projected increase of pupils with EHCP Plans for the next 10 years will be 3000 – 4000 pupils.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Matters arising</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Item number</th> <th>Action</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Action 7.6.1</b></td> <td>The revised terms of reference were tabled and agreed. The terms of reference for the HNB, DSG and Early working parties are also being reviewed. These will be circulated to members and tabled at the next forum meeting.</td> <td>Circulated on 25.11.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Action 7.6.1</b></td> <td>Produce a flowchart that shows the officers responsible for the governance structures management and reporting lines of the HNB strategy.</td> <td>MJ</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Action 10.5</b></td> <td>Circulate demographic report produced by MJ showing pupils on ECHP plans</td> <td>Circulated on 2.12.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Action 10.8</b></td> <td>Circulate the minutes of the meeting on 8 October to all members.</td> <td>Circulated on 21.11.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Action 10.12</b></td> <td>Report outcome of the NFF consultation and present recommendations at the Schools Forum meeting on <b>13 January 2022.</b></td> <td>Schools block working group</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Matters arising			Item number	Action	Status	<b>Action 7.6.1</b>	The revised terms of reference were tabled and agreed. The terms of reference for the HNB, DSG and Early working parties are also being reviewed. These will be circulated to members and tabled at the next forum meeting.	Circulated on 25.11.21	<b>Action 7.6.1</b>	Produce a flowchart that shows the officers responsible for the governance structures management and reporting lines of the HNB strategy.	MJ	<b>Action 10.5</b>	Circulate demographic report produced by MJ showing pupils on ECHP plans	Circulated on 2.12.21	<b>Action 10.8</b>	Circulate the minutes of the meeting on 8 October to all members.	Circulated on 21.11.21	<b>Action 10.12</b>	Report outcome of the NFF consultation and present recommendations at the Schools Forum meeting on <b>13 January 2022.</b>	Schools block working group	
Matters arising																							
Item number	Action	Status																					
<b>Action 7.6.1</b>	The revised terms of reference were tabled and agreed. The terms of reference for the HNB, DSG and Early working parties are also being reviewed. These will be circulated to members and tabled at the next forum meeting.	Circulated on 25.11.21																					
<b>Action 7.6.1</b>	Produce a flowchart that shows the officers responsible for the governance structures management and reporting lines of the HNB strategy.	MJ																					
<b>Action 10.5</b>	Circulate demographic report produced by MJ showing pupils on ECHP plans	Circulated on 2.12.21																					
<b>Action 10.8</b>	Circulate the minutes of the meeting on 8 October to all members.	Circulated on 21.11.21																					
<b>Action 10.12</b>	Report outcome of the NFF consultation and present recommendations at the Schools Forum meeting on <b>13 January 2022.</b>	Schools block working group																					
<b>1.7</b>	<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>																						
<b>1.7.1</b>	The Clerk reported that there are vacancies on the forum had been promoted widely in the weekly bulletins and in recent Governors’ newsletters. HEP will continue to promote the work of the schools forum to attract new members. <b>ACTION: Clerk - NA</b>	<b>ACTION: Clerk - NA</b>																					
<b>1.7.2</b>	She confirmed that there are currently the following vacancies on the forum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary Headteacher place x 1</li> <li>• Secondary governor place x 2</li> <li>• Primary governor place x 1</li> </ul>																						
<b>3</b>	<b>DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (DSG)</b>																						
<b>3.1</b>	<b>DSG OUTURN 2021-22 QUARTER 2 UPDATE</b>																						
<b>3.1.1</b>	BS presented the interim update report which was for noting. Graph A was highlighted in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Schools block, Central Services block and the Early Years block are projected to be on target in terms of spending</li> <li>• The High Needs Block had a projected overspend of £6.4m</li> <li>• The proportion of the overspend against the total DSG is 3.14%</li> </ul>																						

<p><b>3.1.2</b></p>	<p>BS also referred to table A explaining that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current High Needs Block overspend appeared to be decreasing. The overspend for the fiscal year 2020/21 was £6.8m and this year it had reduced to £6.4m</li> <li>• The brought forward for the year so far is -£17m making the total DSG deficit at the end of the year £23.4m.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3.1.3</b></p>	<p><b>Early Years funding</b> BS explained that since the report was published, the funding for early years has remained the same as there was a clawback which resulted in an accrual. It is anticipated that the funding will remain the same.</p>	
<p><b>3.1.4</b></p>	<p><b>High Needs Block</b> It was reported that the SEND strategy consultation closed in the first week of November. The outcome of the consultation will be reported at the next Schools Forum meeting on 13 January and to the Children’s and Young People Scrutiny committee.</p> <p>The LA is still awaiting publication of the SEND review from the DfE.</p>	
<p><b>3.1.5</b></p>	<p><b>Schools Block</b> BS reported that there are 5 new schools that have requested cashflow advances and have licenced deficits. This brings the total to £19K. The reasons for the licenced deficits are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Falling pupil numbers</li> <li>• Loss of traded income due to Covid as the DfE had reimbursed schools for loss of expenditure and not income.</li> <li>• Assumed funding for SEND pupils</li> </ul> <p>The Chair thanked BS for his report and invited questions from members. The questions below followed:</p>	
<p><b>3.1.6</b></p>	<p><b>WW:</b> Requested clarification regarding the Early Years Block funding in view of the accrual and the expected announcements from the ESFA and DfE regarding the large clawback based on the lag model and asked if the indicative projection is still accurate?</p> <p><b>Answer BS:</b> BS confirmed that the Early years block funding was indicative. As there were fewer pupils there was a clawback, providers hadn’t been paid and the approach was that the LA will retain the funds if possible, however if the funds do need to be given back then the LA will do so. It had been accounted for either way in terms of the outturn.</p>	
<p><b>3.1.7</b></p>	<p><b>Question WW:</b> Has the DfE and ESFA given an indication of the impact of funding on the Early Years block funding for the next fiscal year 2022-23?</p> <p><b>Answer BS:</b> The figures from the DSG grant have been reviewed, however the guidance hasn’t yet been reviewed but will be looked at more closely.</p>	

<p><b>3.1.8</b></p> <p><b>3.1.9</b></p>	<p><b>Questions AW:</b> As the overspend this year is lower than last year, what steps have schools taken to achieve this? If the licenced deficit is due to falling pupil numbers are schools going to face funding issues in the future?</p> <p><b>Answer BS:</b> The cost of funding pupils on ECHP plans has gone up by 11% whilst the funding received has gone up by 8% which hasn't covered the increasing number of pupils on EHCP plans and pupils have been placed outside the borough. However, the rate of pupils on EHCP plans may be levelling out and in addition this has been under considerable scrutiny which has had an impact.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> WW - Does the forecast projection for HNB include the projected overspend for Quarter 3 and Quarter 4?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> BS: The predictions are based on the current Quarter 2. If the provision can be bought into the borough then there will be less impact.</p> <p>ER explained that the LA had been liaising with primary schools, falling rolls and the decline in birth rates are likely to have an impact on pupil numbers. The current approach is not to close schools and to reduce pan to make schools staying open more viable. There are currently lower numbers in the primary schools around covid and departure out of London to work remotely which will also impact the secondary school sector. In addition, European families have returned home due to Brexit.</p> <p>She also explained that it had been noted from initial workshops held with schools and COGs alongside Isos partnership that many schools have asked for a central directive or steer from the LA and we will be exploring whether presenting some recommended options is the best way forward to enable localised decisions by governors. Feedback suggested that some schools were open to exploring reductions in PAN and willing to revisit old partnerships. We also heard some would be willing to explore new partnerships including federations and informal memorandums of understanding. However, this is part of a larger piece of work and there isn't a quick fix solution around this as there are statutory timescales when reducing PAN.</p> <p>LB commented that the issue of out of borough placements needs to be addressed as there are considerable budgetary implications.</p> <p>Cllr Brabazon explained that the recent spending review is about capital and not revenue for the High Needs Block. She explained that schools needed to be protected and the provision of pupils with SEND needs to be reviewed to bring provision into the borough.</p> <p>The Chair thanked members for their questions and confirmed that members noted the Quarter 2 update.</p>	
<p><b>3.2</b></p>	<p><b>DSG/HNB RECOVERY PLAN VERBAL REPORT</b></p>	
<p><b>3.2.1</b></p>	<p>BS explained that the Steering Group had met with the ESFA. In addition, a working group had been looking at the content and quality of provision.</p>	
<p><b>3.2.2</b></p>	<p>MJ reported the work that had been carried out as part of the HNB recovery plan that included:</p>	

<p>3.2.3</p> <p>3.2.4</p> <p>3.2.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monitoring of child data and calculations</li> <li>• Work with Isos to look at the fair funding of children with SEND</li> <li>• <b>SEND contingency</b> - the allocation of resources and bringing provision into Haringey</li> <li>• <b>SEND sufficiency</b> – there are funds that need to be utilised to benefit children in the borough. Work has been taking place with capital programme experts to review of out of borough places</li> <li>• The use of Alternative Provision and the change programme</li> <li>• Meetings with Special Schools have been taking place to forecast spending, sufficiency and strategy</li> </ul> <p><b>Question LB:</b> As out of borough placements are so costly what monitoring is taking place to address these costly processes and what is being done to bring these into the borough and who monitors this?</p> <p><b>Answer: MJ:</b> <i>MJ Children who attend out of borough provision are required to have an EHCP. MJ monitors this and reviews each case to check if the child's needs are being met by the provision. There is an agreement with the HEP where the education being offered out of borough is monitored to check if that a high standard of education is offered.</i></p> <p><b>Question HF:</b> What is the process by which the LA SEND Team supports and advises parents to make choices as it has been reported by parents that the team has directed parents to weblink to a list of schools as the LA can't support parents in making decision. How does it work in terms of the advisory process in terms of helping parents about the best provision for their school? If a parent understands the needs of their child but not the in borough or out of borough provision offers how do we know if the child has been met ?</p> <p><b>Answer: MJ</b> <i>the LA can't give advice or support parents on this, in addition the legislation is clear on this. The LA can direct parents to the organisations that can offer support. The LA will always look at an in-borough school and parental preference first. For a small number of children specialist provision may be required as mainstream provision may not always meet their needs. MJ suggested that HF attends a SEND panel meeting and also FAQs to Headteachers could be circulated: <b>ACTION: MJ to invite HF to a SEND Panel meeting</b></i></p> <p><b>Question: AW</b> Why are out of borough schools so costly?</p> <p><b>Answer: MJ</b> the schools are independent schools and the provision is very expensive.</p>	<p>MJ</p>
<p>3.3</p>	<p><b>REPORT SEN CONTINGENCY 2022-23 UPDATE</b></p>	
<p>3.3.1</p>	<p>BS presented the report and explained that the formula for SEND contingency is the same formula for distribution and the same funding as last year. The report proposes a transfer of 0.25% from Schools Block of DSG to the High Needs Block to fund the disproportionately higher number of SEND pupils. This is approximately £537k for the financial year 2022-23 and is part of the schools' consultation on the DSG allocations and could change depending on roll numbers from all schools including academies</p>	

<p>3.3.2</p> <p>3.3.3</p> <p>3.3.4</p> <p>3.3.5</p>	<p>BS highlighted that the current agreement for SEN contingency funding consists of £1.3m split into two different distribution methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £900k distributed solely to secondary schools</li> <li>• £400k split between primary and secondary schools.</li> </ul> <p>Schools that have high numbers of SEND pupils will effectively doubles the funds received for funding for SEND pupils.</p> <p><b>Question: LP:</b> Item 1.4 on the report states that £900k for secondary schools is equivalent to £75k for each of the 12 secondaries and is re-distributed amongst secondary schools. Is that based on the number of SEN pupils?</p> <p><b>Answer: BS:</b> <i>It is based on the number of SEND pupils on EHCPs and does vary according to the number of SEND pupils in schools.</i></p> <p>WW explained that this was historically introduced to ensure inclusivity.</p> <p><b>Question: MM</b> Will the allocation to primary schools be greater than secondary schools in the future?</p> <p><b>Answer: BS:</b> <i>In line with the formula, where schools have a disproportionately higher number of SEND pupils they will eligible for SEND contingency funding. There are currently 3 secondary schools that have disproportionately higher SEND pupils, there is a higher number of primary schools that qualify for the allocation. The figures from December 2020 were used to calculate the allocations, schools will receive the funding for the fiscal year 2022-23.</i></p> <p><b>ER included a comment in chat:</b> Stating that: Cllr Brabazon and ER had met with the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State (Minister for Children and Families) on another matter. They were informed that the SEND review would be published in the "first quarter of 2022" and that significant money had been earmarked for SEND, including for capital.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that all three reports on the DSG were noted by members.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p><b>SCHOOLS IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY UPDATE</b></p>	
<p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.2</p> <p>4.1.3</p> <p>4.1.4</p>	<p>MA presented the update. He explained the report is for noting and covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on Schools in Financial Difficulty</li> <li>• Updates on School Resource Management Advisory programme</li> <li>• Updates on School Finance Training Sessions</li> </ul> <p>He explained that schools that had used agency staff due to Covid had saved money, however schools that had permanent staff have higher staffing costs.</p> <p>At year end there was £2.4m outstanding, this has increased. The LA is supporting schools with cash flow difficulties. However, schools are being encouraged to participate in the Schools Resource Management Advisory Programme (SRMA) programme to forecast and look ahead.</p> <p>Schools with licenced deficits are expected to have three-year deficit recovery plans in place.</p>	

<p><b>4.1.5</b></p>	<p>The Schools Finance Team have been supporting schools with licensed deficits without charge so schools don't have to employ consultants.</p>	
<p><b>4.1.6</b></p>	<p>A number of schools have signed up to the SRMA programme. The programme helps schools to formulate a strategy to bring budgets in order. The ESFA have asked the Haringey Schools Finance Team to be part of a case study.</p>	
<p><b>4.1.7</b></p>	<p>The Schools Finance training sessions being delivered. The sessions include a 30- minute update for headteachers and a longer session for School Business Managers.</p>	
	<p>The Chair thanked MA for the report and invited questions from members:</p>	
<p><b>4.1.9</b></p>	<p><b>Question:</b> MM Is it clear that the largest number of schools in financial difficulty are primary schools with declining pupil numbers – how are these schools going to survive?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> BS <i>It is clear that a number of schools are losing considerable income due to falling rolls. This is the ideal time for schools to review funds being spent and put alternative structures into place. Early action is crucial to ensure that schools do not experience serious financial issues. Two more training sessions on Integrated Curriculum Led Financial Planning have taken place that have been delivered by the SMRA Advisor for the DfE have been well attended.</i></p>	
<p><b>4.1.10</b></p>	<p><b>Question:</b> MM Some schools have already reduced PAN – where does that leave them?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> ER <i>explained that it is important that schools bring in PAN as funding has reduced and many schools are struggling with finances. This is particularly the case with one form entry schools. It is important to recognise this early, it is going to be very challenging for many schools going forward this is the case across London and also nationally.</i></p>	
<p><b>4.1.11</b></p>	<p><b>Questions:</b> LP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why does the bar chart show 9 schools with a licensed deficit whilst table show 15 schools with licensed deficits?</li> <li>• Why is there a big divergence between the closing balances for primaries for 2019-20 and 2020-21?</li> <li>• In terms of COVID how much is due to the medium term Covid impact where income has been reduced?</li> </ul> <p><b>Answer:</b> BS year on year there have been schools added which is why numbers have increased. In terms of sources of funding schools still have overheads related to running lettings without the income, the difficulty that schools are facing is a loss of income, falling roll numbers and SEND place pressures. These schools are having cashflow issues. The Schools Finance Team is working to support these schools and put 3-year plans in place and to see if schools can maintain the same standard of education with the actions being taken. There is also a Restructure and Scrutiny Panel Chaired by ER. He advised that schools should enlist external support to review spending and make long -term strategic decisions</p>	



4.1.12	<p><b>Question:</b> LP: Are you surprised that primary closing balances have gone up significantly and that licenced deficits for some schools have also gone up?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> WW: This is because closing balances are not just revenue, they are an amalgamation of both revenue and capital. Some schools have not been spending on capital due to Covid, after school club and breakfast club staff who may have been furloughed. In view of this, the closing balances are likely to show a downward projection in comparison to the previous year.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed the Forum had noted the report.</p>	
5	<b>REPORTS FROM WORKING GROUPS</b>	
5.1	<b>SCHOOLS BLOCK WORKING GROUP</b>	
5.1.1	<p>The Chair invited an update from the Schools Block Working Group previously known as the DSG Working Group</p>	
5.1.2	<p>WW explained that the Working Group had met on 17 November with the live October 2021 census date, considerable work was carried out in preparation. Linda Sarr and Paul Murphy have just joined the group as new permanent members. He encouraged governors to come forward if they are interested in being members as there are currently 2 governor vacancies.</p> <p>The consultation has been circulated the deadline for response is 10<sup>th</sup> December.</p>	
5.1.3	<p>BS and MA had met with the ESFA to look at different funding models such as differential minimum funding guarantees models for Primary and Secondary Sectors to address funding ratio imbalances. The ESFA has confirmed that this would need to be a disapplication, there can only be one MFG. As Haringey has local arrangements, the DfE and ESFA had confirmed that they may not be able to agree the models.</p>	
5.1.4	<p><b>Question:</b> HF: Chairs from the West Group had asked if there is going to be any guidance regarding a recommended option from Schools Forum?</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> WW: <i>Advised schools to monitor and benchmark widely with other schools. The principle consideration will be the High Needs Block.</i></p>	
5.1.5	<p>WW confirmed that the Schools Block Working Group will be meeting on 16 December to review the feedback from the consultation, which will be confirmed at the next Schools Forum Meeting on 13 January 2022.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the Schools Block Working Group for the report.</p>	
5.2	<b>HNB WORKING GROUP</b>	
	The update in item 3.3 above covered the work of the HNB Working Group.	
5.3	<b>EARLY YEARS WORKING PARTY</b>	
5.3.1	<p>MM reported that SEND has not been included into the early years review. This will be addressed.</p>	
5.3.2	<p>There have been changes to the Early Years block as a result of the spending review. It appears there are likely to be increments for early years settings.</p>	

5.3.3	There have been issues in Early Years settings with financial support for agency staff, which has put pressure on some settings.	
6	<b>ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS</b>	
6.1	JL explained that the DfE have undertaken a consultation to remove the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant of £50m nationally. This was announced during half term.	
6.2	The consultation includes 2 proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To remove 50% of the grant in 2022/23</li> <li>To remove the remaining 50% in 2023/24</li> </ul>	
6.3	The proposals are explicitly part of wider plans for the academisation of schools. Haringey LA currently receives a £247K grant for School Improvement which is passported in its entirety to HEP for school improvement.	
6.4	It was agreed that Schools Forum should write to confirm that the forum does not agree with the reduction in budgets. JL and WW agreed to draft a response to be sent from the Forum. <b>ACTION: JL, ER and WW</b>	<b>JL, ER and WW</b>
7	<b>CLOSE</b>	
	The Chair thanked members for attending and closed the meeting.	
	<b>DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thursday 13 January 4pm</li> <li>Thursday 24 February 4pm</li> <li>Thursday 14 July 4pm</li> </ul>	

There being no further business the Meeting closed at 5.50pm